

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
AFFEICATION NO.	FIEING DATE	TRST WANTED HAVENTOR	ATTORAGET BOCKET NO.	CONTROLLING.	
10/802,259	03/17/2004	Robert H. Blick	032026-0761	4314	
23524 75	90 08/26/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER			TRAN, MAI HUONG C		
150 EAST GIL	MAN STREET				
P.O. BOX 1497			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MADISON, WI 53701-1497			2818	•	
			DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)			
		259	BLICK ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examine	er	Art Unit			
	Mai-Huo	7	2818			
The MAILING DATE of this comm	nunication appears on th	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMM Extensions of time may be available under the provise after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this complete of the period for reply specified above is less than this lif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximus Failure to reply within the set or extended period for Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(1)	JNICATION. ions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e ommunication. ty (30) days, a reply within the sta m statutory period will apply and eply will, by statute, cause the ap ths after the mailing date of this of	vent, however, may a reply be time atutory minimum of thirty (30) days will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from aplication to become ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	1.		
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s)	filed on 14 July 2005.					
2a) This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is	non-final.				
. —						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-44</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>21-25</u> is 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20 and 26-44</u> is/are results of the 15 claim(s) is/are objected to results of the 15 claim(s) are subject to results of the 15 claim(s)	s/are withdrawn from co ejected.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to be 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 Augus Applicant may not request that any of Replacement drawing sheet(s) inclu 11) The oath or declaration is objected.	t 2004 is/are: a)⊠ acc bjection to the drawing(s) ding the correction is requ	be held in abeyance. See ired if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d	d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Revie 	w (PTO-948)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-144 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/6/04</u> .			atent Application (PTO-152)			

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II (claims 1-20 and 26-44) drawn to process of making a semiconductor device is acknowledged. Accordingly, claims 21-25 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Applicant has the right to file a divisional application covering the subject matter of the non-elected claims.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that see the election paper. This is not found persuasive because the fields of search for method and device claims are NOT coextensive and the determinations of patentability of method and device claims are different, that is process limitations and device limitations are given weight differently in determining the patentablitity of the claimed inventions. Also, the strategies for doing text searching of the device claims and method claims are different. Thus, separate searches are required.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 and 26-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,379,988 to Peterson et al. in view of the remark.

Regarding to claim 1, Peterson discloses a method of forming microelectromechanical structures comprising providing a microelectromechanical structural feature 24 supported on a layer of sacrificial material 26 and connected to a larger structural element (fig. 4G); applying a film (col. 12, line 16) onto the structural feature by energy beam assisted deposit of material from a vapor (col. 12, lines 15-16) through which the beam passes to cover at least a portion of the structural feature; applying a wet etchant to the structural feature covered by the film and to the sacrificial layer supporting the structural feature, the wet etchant selected to etch the sacrificial layer material preferentially as compared to the structural feature and to the film covering it to leave the structural feature supported by its connection to the larger structural element;

Application/Control Number: 10/802,259

Art Unit: 2818

and removing the covering film from the structural feature (col. 8, lines 57-67, col. 11, lines 47-52). However, Peterson does not disclose nanomechanical structures (NEMS).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form nanomechanical structures (NEMS) since it was known in the art to form nanomechanical structures (NEMS) instead of microelectromechanical structures.

Regarding to claim 2, the method wherein the vapor contains carbon and wherein the film deposited on the structural feature comprises a carbon film (col. 12, line 16).

Regarding to claims 3, 14, 22, 28, and 37, Peterson discloses the claimed invention except for the method wherein the carbon film is deposited to a thickness of at least 5 nm.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to form the carbon film to a thickness of at least 5 nm, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding to claims 4, 9, 39, and 41, the method wherein the energy beam is an electron beam that is scanned over the structural feature (col. 12, lines 15-20).

Regarding to claims 5, 15, 23, 29, and 38, Peterson discloses the claimed invention except for the method wherein the carbon film is deposited to a thickness of 40 to 50 nm.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to form the carbon film to a thickness of 40 to 50 nm, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding to claims 6, 27, and 36, the method wherein removing the covering film of carbon is carried out by oxygen plasma etching (col. 9, lines 18-19).

Regarding to claims 7, 16, 24, and 30, the method wherein the structural feature is formed of silicon, the sacrificial layer is formed of silicon dioxide (col. 8, lines 11-12), and the wet etchant is buffered hydrofluoric acid (col. 9, lines 32-35).

Regarding to claims 8, 17, 25, 31, and 40, Peterson discloses the claimed invention except for the method wherein the structural feature has a cross-sectional dimension that is 500 nm or less.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to form the structural feature that has a cross-sectional dimension that is 500 nm or less, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result

Art Unit: 2818

effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding to claims 10, 18, 32, and 42, the method wherein the electron beam is provided by a scanning electron microscope (col. 12, lines 15-20).

Regarding to claims 11, 19, and 43, the method wherein the vapor is an organic vapor present in a sample chamber of the scanning electron microscope (col. 12, lines 15-20).

Regarding to claims 12, 20, 34, and 44, the method wherein the electron beam is scanned over the structural feature and over an opening between the structural feature and adjacent structure to form a film extending over the opening between and connecting the structural feature and the adjacent-structure microscope (col. 12, lines 15-20, figs. 2c, 2d).

Regarding to claim 13, Peterson discloses a method of forming microelectromechanical structures comprising providing a microelectromechanical structural feature, supported on a layer of sacrificial material 26 and connected to a larger structural element (fig. 4G); applying a film of carbon (col. 12, line 16) onto the structural feature by scanning an electron beam over the structural feature to deposit

material from a vapor containing carbon through which the beam passes to cover at least a portion of the structural feature (col. 12, lines 14-19); applying a wet etchant to the structural feature covered by the film and to the sacrificial kayer supporting the structural feature, the wet etchant selected to etch the sacrificial layer material preferentially as compared to the structural feature and to the film covering it to leave the structural feature supported by its connection to the larger structural element (col. 9, lines 25-38, col. 11, lines 47-52); and removing the covering film from the structural feature by oxygen plasma etching (col. 9, lines 18-20).

Peterson does not disclose the nanomechanical structural feature having at least one cross-sectional dimension of 500nm or less.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to form the nanomechanical structural feature that has a cross-sectional dimension that is 500 nm or less, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding to claim 26, Peterson discloses a method of forming structural features on a semiconductor base comprising providing a structural feature on a semiconductor base; applying a film of carbon (col. 12, line 16) onto the structural feature by scanning an electron beam over the structural feature to deposit material from a vapor containing carbon through which the beam passes to cover at least a portion of the structural feature

Application/Control Number: 10/802,259

Art Unit: 2818

(col. 12, lines 4-20); applying a wet etchant to the structural feature covered by the film and to the semiconductor base, the wet etchant selected to etch material of the semiconductor base preferentially as compared to the film covering the structural feature; and removing the covering carbon film from the structural feature (cols. 7-13).

Regarding to claim 35, Peterson discloses a method of releasably holding structural features on a base comprising providing a structural feature on a surface of a base; applying a film of carbon onto the structural feature by energy beam assisted deposit of material from a vapor containing carbon through which the beam passes to cover at least a portion of the structural feature and an adjoining portion of the surface of the base to hold the structural feature in place on the base; and removing the covering carbon film from the structural feature (cols. 7-13).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication on earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mai-Huong Tran, (571) 272-1796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM. The examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/802,259

Art Unit: 2818

Page 9

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR, Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mai-Huong Tran